



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/598,333	06/21/2000	Hidemi Sasaki	Q59726	6395

7590 11/15/2004  
Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER

HO, TUAN V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2615

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/598,333

Applicant(s)

SASAKI, HIDEMI

Examiner

Tuan V Ho

Art Unit

2615

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See notes.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: 9.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 10-13.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: attached is a Notice of reference cited.

  
Tuan V Ho  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 2615

Art Unit: 2615

Applicant's arguments filed 8/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to claim 1, Applicants argues that the power sources and voltage sources are not the same. In response to the arguments, the examiner notes that DC/DC converter 200 that converts a main power source into a plurality of power sources; where the power sources have different voltages which are required by different components in the Shintani camera. It is noted in US patent 3,745,901, Miyakawa et al discloses that DC/DC converter 1 provides a circuit power source (col. 3, lines 63). Therefore, Shintani discloses DC/DC converter 200 that provides a plurality of power sources to the camera. The examiner understands the claimed power sources, located in different housings, which are different from the prior art; however, claim 1 is broad enough to read on it.

With regard to claim 7, noted that CPU 100 has the same function of a switching device switching power sources in accordance with Table 1, col. 9, line 26-51.

With regard to claim 2, the reason for combining the Shintani and Suzuki is clearly discussed in paragraph 3 of the last Office action.

With regard to claim 3, it is noted that although the prior art not discloses an action of pulling a print out of the

Art Unit: 2615

printer; however, the pulling action is inherently in the process to remove the print from the printer. Noted that one of skill in the art would modify the printer of Shintani and Aoto et al by adding gears and motors in order to make the head move. The reason for combining is clearly discussed in paragraph 3 of the last Office action.

With regard to claim 6, the reason for combining the references is to make the replacement of batteries more convenience and easier.

For the above reasons, the rejections are repeated.



TUAN HO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER